UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/742,761	12/20/2000	Vij Rajarajan	13768.783.228	6649

47973 7590 01/26/2007
WORKMAN NYDEGGER/MICROSOFT
1000 EAGLE GATE TOWER
60 EAST SOUTH TEMPLE
SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84111

EXAMINER	
ZHEN, LI B	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2194	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	01/26/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/742,761	RAJARAJAN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Li B. Zhen	2194	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *03 November 2006*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-51* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-51* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

WILLIAM THOMSON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1 – 51 are pending in the current application.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 – 3 and 37 – 51 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

3. Applicant's arguments filed 11/03/2006 fails to traverse the rejection of claims 4 – 36. For example, applicant groups independent claim 4 with a group of dependent claims 2-5, 7-10, 15-16, 22-26, 31 and 35 [p. 17, line 9] and asserted that each of these claims depends either directly or indirectly from claim 1 and consequently includes the limitations of independent claim 1. Examiner respectfully disagrees and notes that independent claim 4 does not include the limitation "indicative of behavior"; therefore, applicant's arguments with regards to claim 1 does not apply to claim 4. Since applicant failed to effectively traverse the rejection of claim 4 and did not provide any amendments to claim 4, the previous rejection to claims 4 – 36 are maintained.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claims 4, 5, 7 – 10, 15, 16, 22 – 26, 31, 35 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by "Response to UML 2.0 Request for Information" [hereinafter referred to as Clark].

6. As to claim 4, Clark teaches a notation data structure [Concrete Representations [Concrete Syntax], Fig. 1; p. 10] having a set of at least one interface for accessing a plurality of methods [basic mechanisms are classes and associations. Additional power comes from the ability to relate classes through generalisation and the ability to construct sets of objects by navigating associations and filtering; Section 3.1.2.3, p. 14] therein;

a semantic data structure [Semantics Domain, Fig. 1, p. 10] separate from the notation data structure [an architecture which separates concrete syntax, abstract syntax, semantics domain and the relationships between each pair; Section 4.1, p. 24], the semantic data structure having a set of at least one interface for accessing a plurality of methods [basic mechanisms are classes and associations. Additional power comes from the ability to relate classes through generalisation and the ability to construct sets of objects by navigating associations and filtering; Section 3.1.2.3, p. 14] therein, the semantic data structure being associated with the notation data structure to provide a model element [a mapping from the syntax [domain] to a semantics domain. Both syntax and semantics domains may have concrete representations; p. 10].

7. As to claim 5, Clark teaches the notation data structure comprises a notation object and the semantic data structure comprises a semantic object [basic mechanisms are classes and associations. Additional power comes from the ability to relate classes through generalisation and the ability to construct sets of objects by navigating associations and filtering; Section 3.1.2.3, p. 14] and wherein a paradigm server associates the notation object with the semantic object to provide the model element [a mapping from the syntax [domain] to a semantics domain. Both syntax and semantics domains may have concrete representations; p. 10].

8. As to claim 7, Clark teaches one of the methods of the notation data structure provides information identifying a library of notations to which the notation data structure belongs [Section 3.1.3.2. A kernel library, p. 19].

9. As to claim 8, Clark teaches one of the methods of the notation data structure provides type information corresponding to the notation data structure [Stereotypes can be seen as a simple way of extending concrete syntax, and support for them could be provided in the kernel library; Section 4.2, p. 24].

10. As to claim 9, Clark teaches one of the methods of the notation data structure provides subtype information corresponding to the notation data structure [Section 3.1.3.2, p. 19].

11. As to claim 10, Clark teaches one of the methods of the notation data structure provides a name of the notation data structure [names; p. 19, last paragraph].

12. As to claim 15, Clark teaches one of the methods of the notation data structure provides information indicative of whether the notation is capable of visually indicating attach-points at which arcs can connect [paths; p. 19, last paragraph].

13. As to claim 16, Clark teaches one of the methods of the notation data structure provides information indicative of a minimum and maximum size of the notation [Fig. 4, p. 16].

14. As to claim 22, Clark teaches one of the methods of the notation data structure provides information identifying a library of semantics [Section 3.1.3.2. A kernel library, p. 19] to which the semantic data structure belongs [Section 4.3 Relationships, p. 25].

15. As to claim 23, Clark teaches one of the methods of the semantic data structure provides type information corresponding to the semantic data structure [Stereotypes can be seen as a simple way of extending concrete syntax, and support for them could be provided in the kernel library; Section 4.2, p. 24].

16. As to claim 24, Clark teaches one of the methods of the semantic data structure provides subtype information corresponding to the semantic data structure [Section 3.1.3.2, p. 19].

17. As to claim 25, Clark teaches one of the methods of the semantic data structure provides a name of the semantic data structure [names; p. 19, last paragraph].

18. As to claim 26, Clark teaches the semantic data structure includes a set of at least one requirement related to notation data structures which can connect thereto [3.2 Constraint languages, p. 23].

19. As to claim 31, Clark teaches one requirement of the set requires that the notation data structure have a number of attach-points at which arcs can connect [paths; p. 19, last paragraph].

20. As to claim 35, Clark teaches the model element corresponds to a node, and wherein the node includes at least one method to determine the notation data structure and semantic data structure and corresponding thereto [Section 3.1.2.3, p. 14].

21. As to claim 36, Clark teaches the model element corresponds to an arc, and wherein the arc includes at least one method to determine the notation data structure and semantic data structure and corresponding thereto [paths; p. 19, last paragraph].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

22. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

23. Claims 1 – 3, 37 – 39, 41, 43 – 49 and 51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Clark in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,222,537 to Smith et al. [hereinafter Smith, cited in the previous office action].

24. As to claim 1, Clark teaches the invention substantially as claimed including a complete set of visual modeling tools for development of robust, efficient solutions to real business needs in the client/server, distributed enterprise, and real-time system environments [UML, Section 2, p. 2] and the method of:

providing a plurality of notations [Concrete Representations [Concrete Syntax], Fig. 1; p. 10], each notation comprising a visual representation [e.g. diagram, box, Fig. 1] of a model element [notation guide in Chapter 3 would probably be split into two: a precise definition of the concrete syntax...and a user guide to the language; Section 3.1.6, p. 22];

providing a plurality of semantics [Semantics Domain, Fig. 1, p. 10], each semantic separate from each of a plurality of notations [an architecture which separates concrete syntax, abstract syntax, semantics domain and the relationships between each

pair; Section 4.1, p. 24] comprising a meaning in a modeling environment of a model element [Section 4.4; p. 25]; and

associating a selected notation with a selected semantic to provide a model element having a visual representation and a meaning in a modeling environment [a mapping from the syntax [domain] to a semantics domain. Both syntax and semantics domains may have concrete representations; p. 10]. Although Clark teaches the invention substantially, Clark does not specifically disclose each semantic comprising a meaning indicative of behavior in a modeling environment of a model element.

However, Smith teaches semantic [col. 7, lines 45 – 55] comprising a meaning indicative of behavior [col. 9, lines 27 – 41] in a modeling environment of a model element and associating a notation [each of the images being associated with one of the two basic states of the button--firing (pressed) and idle (not pressed); col. 6, lines 47 – 60] with a semantic [setting behavioral styles and other control attributes in association with these states; col. 7, line 55 – col. 8, line 6].

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the invention of Clark to includes the features of assigning each semantic a meaning indicative of behavior in a modeling environment of a model element because this provides great flexibility in the setting of property attributes of controls (which are the non-functional, appearance attributes) while the functional aspects (the state model and the function of the control) are predefined [col. 3, lines 6 – 20 of Smith].

25. As to claim 2, Clark teaches the selected notation and the selected semantic each comprise an object [Fig. 4, p. 16], and wherein associating the selected notation with the selected semantic comprises connecting the selected notation object to the selected semantic object via object interfaces [basic mechanisms are classes and associations. Additional power comes from the ability to relate classes through generalisation and the ability to construct sets of objects by navigating associations and filtering; Section 3.1.2.3, p. 14 and p. 6, second to last paragraph].

26. As to claim 3, Clark teaches the objects are connected to a paradigm server [Section 3.1.3.2; p. 19].

27. As to claim 37, Clark as modified teaches a notation comprising a representation of a model element in at least one modeling environment, the notation including an interface configured to provide access to methods therein [UML, Section 2, p. 2 of Clark];

a semantic [Semantics Domain, Fig. 1, p. 10 of Clark] separate from the notation [an architecture which separates concrete syntax, abstract syntax, semantics domain and the relationships between each pair; Section 4.1, p. 24 of Clark], the semantic comprising a meaning indicative of behavior [col. 9, lines 27 – 41 of Smith] of a model element in at least one modeling environment [Section 4.4; p. 25 of Clark], the semantic including an interface configured to provide access to methods therein [basic mechanisms are classes and associations. Additional power comes from the ability to

relate classes through generalisation and the ability to construct sets of objects by navigating associations and filtering; Section 3.1.2.3, p. 14 of Clark]; and

a paradigm server, [Section 3.1.3.2; p. 19 of Clark] the server connected to a modeling environment and configured to access the methods of the notation and the methods of the semantic via their respective interfaces, [basic mechanisms are classes and associations. Additional power comes from the ability to relate classes through generalisation and the ability to construct sets of objects by navigating associations and filtering; Section 3.1.2.3, p. 14 of Clark] and further configured to enable a determination as to whether the paradigm server, notation and semantic are each compatible [3.2 Constraint languages, p. 23 of Clark], and if they are compatible, to associate the notation with the semantic to provide a model element in the modeling environment [a mapping from the syntax [domain] to a semantics domain. Both syntax and semantics domains may have concrete representations; p. 10 of Clark].

28. As to claim 38, Clark teaches the notation and the semantic each comprise an object [basic mechanisms are classes and associations. Additional power comes from the ability to relate classes through generalisation and the ability to construct sets of objects by navigating associations and filtering; Section 3.1.2.3, p. 14].

29. As to claim 39, Clark as modified teaches selecting a selected notation from a plurality of notations [Concrete Representations [Concrete Syntax], Fig. 1; p. 10 of Clark], each notation comprising a visual representation [e.g. diagram, box, Fig. 1 of

Clark] of a model element [notation guide in Chapter 3 would probably be split into two: a precise definition of the concrete syntax...and a user guide to the language; Section 3.1.6, p. 22 of Clark];

selecting a selected semantic indicative of behavior [col. 9, lines 27 – 41 of Smith] from plurality of semantics [Semantics Domain, Fig. 1, p. 10 of Clark], each semantic separate from each notation [an architecture which separates concrete syntax, abstract syntax, semantics domain and the relationships between each pair; Section 4.1, p. 24 of Clark] and comprising a meaning in a modeling environment of a model element [Section 4.4; p. 25 of Clark]; and

validating whether the selected notation [determining which constructs should be defined in the kernel library; p. 20 of Clark] can be associated with the selected semantic [a mapping from the syntax [domain] to a semantics domain. Both syntax and semantics domains may have concrete representations; p. 10 of Clark].

30. As to claim 41, Clark teaches associating the selected notation with the selected semantic to provide a model element [a mapping from the syntax [domain] to a semantics domain. Both syntax and semantics domains may have concrete representations; p. 10].

31. As to claim 43, Clark teaches connecting the selected notation object to the selected semantic object via object interfaces [Section 3.1.2.3, p. 14 and p. 6, second to last paragraph].

32. As to claim 44, Clark teaches having computer-executable instructions [by implementing, compiling and executing it as a program; Section 2.1.2.4, p. 5].

33. As to claim 45, this is a product claim that corresponds to method claim 1, see the rejection to claim 1 above, which also meets this product claim.

34. As to claims 46-47, these are rejected for the same reasons as claims 2-3 above.

35. As to claim 48, Clark as modified teaches a notation data structure [Concrete Representations [Concrete Syntax], Fig. 1; p. 10 of Clark] comprising:

a notation data structure from at least a first provider having a set of at least one interface for accessing a plurality of method [basic mechanisms are classes and associations. Additional power comes from the ability to relate classes through generalisation and the ability to construct sets of objects by navigating associations and filtering; Section 3.1.2.3, p. 14 of Clark] therein; and

a semantic data structure [Semantics Domain, Fig. 1, p. 10 of Clark] indicative of behavior [col. 9, lines 27 – 41 of Smith] from at least a second provider, the semantic data structure separate from the notation data structure [an architecture which separates concrete syntax, abstract syntax, semantics domain and the relationships between each pair; Section 4.1, p. 24 of Clark] and having a set of at least one interface for accessing a plurality of method therein [basic mechanisms are classes and

associations. Additional power comes from the ability to relate classes through generalisation and the ability to construct sets of objects by navigating associations and filtering; Section 3.1.2.3, p. 14 of Clark], the semantic data structure from the at least second provider being associated with the notation data structure from the at least first provider to provide a model element [a mapping from the syntax [domain] to a semantics domain. Both syntax and semantics domains may have concrete representations; p. 10 of Clark].

36. As to claims 49 and 51, these are rejected for the same reasons as claims 5 and 26 above.

37. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Clark in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,542,595 to Hemzal [cited in previous office action].

38. As to claim 6, Clark doesn't explicitly disclose a server validating the semantic object.

However, Hemzal teaches a sever that validates a semantic object [e.g., see col. 10, lines 1 – 25].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the teaching of Hemzal into the system of Clark so that server validates that the semantic object. The modification would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated so that a validation

module can validate configuration data which can be used as operating parameters to a generating module, server, control module and storage.

39. Claims 11 – 14, 20, 21, 27 – 30, 33 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Clark in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,958,012 to Battat et al. [hereinafter Battat, cited in previous office action].

40. As to claim 11, Clark doesn't explicitly disclose the notation data structure is capable of being resized.

However, Battat teaches one of the methods of the notation data structure provides information indicative of whether the notation data structure is capable of being resized" [e.g., see module changes in position in col. 9:18-37].

41. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Battat into the system of Clark, to resize the notation data structure because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to have all the displayed objects fitted in the window.

42. As to claim 12, Clark doesn't explicitly disclose the notation data structure is visually indicating selected and unselected states.

However, Battat teaches one of the methods of the notation data structure provides information indicative of whether the notation is capable of visually indicating

selected and unselected states [e.g., see col. 12: 19-67 to 13:1-7 and FIG. 10G, item 'Mode' has 3 to be selected ['Camera Fly', 'Move Object' and 'Edit Object']].

43. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Battat into the system of Clark to visually indicate selected and unselected states because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to allow the user to select each of the various models used in the adaptive display.

44. As to claim 13, Clark does not explicitly disclose the notation is capable of being in a visible or a hidden state.

However, Battat teaches one of the methods of the notation data structure provides information indicative of whether the notation is capable of being in a visible or a hidden state [e.g., see col. 8:60-67 to 9: 1-17 and FIG. 3a, item 323].

45. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Battat into the system of Clark, to be capable of being in a visible or a hidden state because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to determine whether a preset threshold for visualization has been exceeded with either the status indicator being hidden at module 324 or the appropriate change of status signal being sent.

46. As to claim 14, Clark doesn't explicitly disclose the notation is capable of visually indicating hover-related states.

However, Battat teaches one of the methods of the notation data structure provides information indicative of whether the notation is capable of visually indicating hover-related states [e.g., see col. 14:25-36 and FIG. 11].

47. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Battat into the system of Clakr to be capable of visually indicating hover-related states because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to when traveling over the map, status indicators show the aggregate status for cities and buildings, in the form of globes that hover over the objects.

48. As to claim 20, Clark doesn't explicitly disclose providing information indicative of the notation is capable of doing animations.

However, Battat teaches one of the methods of the notation data structure provides information indicative of whether the notation is capable of doing animations [e.g., see col. 1:45-63].

49. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Battat into the system of Clark to provide information indicative of the notation is capable of doing animations because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated so that website designers pay close attention to how much graphics, sound and animation could be included on their website pages.

50. As to claim 21, Clark doesn't explicitly disclose providing information indicative of a number of states that the notation can visually indicate.

However, Battat teaches one of the methods of the notation data structure provides information indicative of a number of states that the notation can visually indicate [e.g., col. 12:19-67 to 13:1-7 and FIG. 10G, item 'Mode' has 3 to be selected ['Camera Fly', 'Move Object' and 'Edit Object']].

51. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Battat into the system of Clark to provide information indicative of a number of states that the notation can visually indicate because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to allow the user to select each of the various models used in the adaptive display.

52. As to claims 27 – 30, 33 and 34, these are rejected for the similar reasons as claims 11 – 14, 20 and 21 above.

53. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Clark in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,041,143 to Chui et al. [hereinafter Chui, cited in the previous office action].

54. As to claim 17, Clark doesn't explicitly disclose the notation is capable of zooming operations.

However, Chui teaches one of the methods of the notation data structure provides information indicative of whether the notation is capable of zooming operations [e.g., see col. 2:14-30].

55. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Chui into the system of Clark to be capable of capable of zooming operations because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated so that the storage requirements for image files are reduced by storing only thumbnail data and the full image data in an image file, and producing image data structures for other resolution levels on the fly.

56. Claims 18 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Clark in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,353,448 to Scarborough et al. [hereinafter Scarborough, cited in the previous office action].

57. As to claims 18 and 32, Clark doesn't explicitly disclose providing information indicative of supported color depths.

However, Scarborough teaches one of the methods of the notation data structure provides information indicative of supported color depths [e.g., see col. 9:66-67 to 10: 1-26].

58. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Scarborough into the system of Clark to provide information indicative of supported color depths because one of ordinary skill

in the a would have been motivated so that screen display of an end-user configuration screen for adjusting color depth and image display resolution to indicate the status of an object.

59. Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Clark in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,907,704 to Gudmundson et al. [hereinafter Gudmundson, cited in the previous office action].

60. As to claim 19, Clark doesn't explicitly disclose providing information indicative of an iconic representation.

However, Gudmundson teaches one of the methods of the notation data structure provides information indicative of an iconic representation [e.g., see col. 3:63-67 to 4:1- 12].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Gudmundson into the system of Clark to provide information indicative of an iconic representation because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated so that user can clicks on the "minimize" icon, the window will be restored.

61. Claim 42 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Clark and Smith further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,430,538 to Bacon et al. [hereinafter Bacon, cited in the previous office action].

62. As to claim 42, Clark and Smith doesn't explicitly disclose the associating is performed by a paradigm server.

However, Bacon teaches the associating is performed by a paradigm server [e.g., see col. 5:22-47].

63. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Bacon into the system of Clark and Smith so that the associating is performed by a paradigm server because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to reduce client side workload by using paradigm server to perform the associating.

64. Claims 40 and 50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Clark and Smith further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,542,595 to Hemzal [cited in previous office action].

65. As to claims 40 and 50, Clark and Smith doesn't explicitly disclose a server validating the semantic object.

However, Hemzal teaches a sever that validates a semantic object [e.g., see col. 10, lines 1 – 25].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the teaching of Hemzal into the system of Clark and Smith so that server validates that the semantic object. The modification would have been

obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated so that a validation module can validate configuration data which can be used as operating parameters to a generating module, server, control module and storage.

Conclusion

66. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

"A New UML-Compatible Object Relationship Notation (ORN)" discloses a declarative scheme that permits the semantics of a variety of relationships to be conveniently modeled and then defined in a Database Management System.

67. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

CONTACT INFORMATION

68. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Li B. Zhen whose telephone number is (571) 272-3768. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Fri, 8:30am - 5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Thomson can be reached on 571-272-3718. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Li B. Zhen
Examiner
Art Unit 2194

LBZ

WILLIAM THOMSON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100